



Patent

MAIL STOP AF

Group Art Unit: 2625

Examiner: Michael L. Burleson

Confirmation No.: 6715

[illegible]

Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC
Attorneys & Government Relations Professionals

- ☒ No additional claim fee is required.
- ☐ An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below:


AMENDED CLAIMS					
	No. of Claims	Highest No. of Claims Previously Paid For	Extra Claims	Rate	Additional Fee
Total Claims	6	20	0	x \$ 50 (1202)	\$ 0
Independent Claims	4	10	0	x \$ 200 (1201)	0
<input type="checkbox"/> If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$ 360 (1203)					\$ 0
Total Claim Amendment Fee					\$ 0
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Entity Status claimed - subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee					0
TOTAL ADDITIONAL CLAIM FEE DUE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0

- ☐ Charge _____ to Deposit Account No. 02-4800 for the fee due.
- ☐ A check in the amount of _____ is enclosed for the fee due.
- ☐ Charge _____ to credit card for the fee due. Form PTO-2038 is attached.
- ☒ The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17 and 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date March 19, 2007

By: 
James A. LaBarre
Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620



Patent

Attorney's Docket No. 1011350-000265

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)	MAIL STOP AF
Tomohiko Teranishi et al.)	Group Art Unit: 2626
Application No.: 09/729,351)	Examiner: Michael L. Burleson
Filed: December 5, 2000)	Confirmation No.: 6715
For: APPARATUS, METHOD AND)	
COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT)	
FOR PROCESSING DOCUMENT)	
IMAGES OF VARIOUS SIZES AND)	
ORIENTATIONS)	

RESPONSE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated December 18, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6-11.

The rejection of claim 6, on the basis of the *Salgado et al.* patent (U.S. 5,946,527) was repeated. In their previous response, Applicants pointed out that the *Salgado* patent discloses that, when the imaging system is operated in the mixed size originals mode, the size of each document is detected. Then, the appropriate paper size for *that* document is selected. As a result, the document image with the largest size will be printed on paper of a corresponding size, but smaller document images may be printed on smaller paper. As such, the *Salgado* patent does not teach that all of the image data of a print job should be printed on paper with a size equal to or larger than the detected maximum size

In responding to this argument, the most recent Office Action characterizes the *Salgado* patent as teaching that, in the auto-fit mode, the image size of all the